

DECISION RECORD/FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR
WEST SILVIES VALLEY PRESCRIBED BURN

EA OR-025-01-25

INTRODUCTION: Following a 30-day comment period of the West Silvies Valley Prescribed Burn Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-025-01-25, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is issuing a decision for the prescribed burning within the project area in the West Silvies Valley on the Three Rivers Resource Area of the Burns District. The decision is to implement the proposed action of the EA.

DECISION: Having considered a range of alternatives and associated impacts and based on the analysis in the West Silvies Valley Prescribed Burn EA, it is my decision to implement the proposed action which establishes criteria and objectives to reduce surface fuel loading, to reduce overstocking and encroachment of Douglas fir in ponderosa pine stands to improve forest health, to reduce risk of stand replacement fires, to reduce fire hazard to adjacent landowners, to reintroduce fire into the area to mimic natural processes, to maintain the health and vigor of the areas larger trees, and to stimulate growth of grasses, forbs, and shrubs. This decision pertains only to land administered by the BLM.

Rationale for Decision: I have selected the proposed action for the following reasons:

The proposed action reduces the surface fuel loading, which reduces the fire hazard to adjacent landowners, reduces risk of stand replacement fires, and protects areas of high resource value from catastrophic wildfire, insects, and disease.

It reintroduces fire into the area to mimic natural processes, reduces Douglas fir encroachment in ponderosa pine stands which improve forest health by increasing growth and vigor of retained trees, maintains the health and vigor of larger trees in the area, and stimulates growth of grasses, forbs, and shrubs.

Public involvement consisted of direct mailing to 14 individuals, organizations, tribes, agencies, and a notice in the local newspaper. I did not receive any comments during the Finding of No Significant Impact/EA review period.

It is in conformance with Section 7(a)1 of the Endangered Species Act.

It is in compliance with the Three Rivers Resource Management Plan (1992), and the Silvies River Bald Eagle Nest Management Plan (1994).

It is in compliance with Federal laws that mandate the management of public land resources (Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976).

The decision does not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation.
I have also considered alternatives to the proposed action including:

Alternative 1 - No Action: This alternative proposed no fuel reduction treatments would take place. I did not select this alternative because it was not responsive to improving the conditions in the habitat types that are identified in the purpose and need of the EA.

I also considered the use of mechanical treatment to accomplish the identified objectives but did not develop the alternative because it would not decrease the fine fuels or litter component nor would it be cost-effective.

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4 and Form 1842-1. If an appeal is filed, your notice must be filed in the Burns District Office, 28910 Hwy 20 West, Hines, Oregon 97738 by _____, 2002. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed is in error.

If you wish to file a petition, pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21, for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits.
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted.
4. Whether or not the public interest favors granting the stay.

Signature on File
Joan M. Suther
Three Rivers Resource Area Field Manager

10/21/2002
Date